



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

OK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/831,845 04/01/97 CALDER

B P2167/SUN1P1

EXAMINER

LM01/0721

HICKMAN BEYER & WEAVER
PO BOX 61059
PALO ALTO CA 94306

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2755
DATE MAILED:

07/21/99

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/831,845

Applicant(s)

Calder, Bartley H. et al.

Examiner

Lewis Bullock, Jr.

Group Art Unit

2755

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2755

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12-16, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Navigating the Internet" by Gibbs in view of "Windows 95 Secrets" by Livingston.

As to claim 1, Gibbs teaches a computer-implemented framework for associating data (file attachment) with a command object (application) comprising: a data handler mechanism (graphical user interface) arranged to interface with the application (e-mail program, i.e. Elm/Pegasus/Pine/Eudora) (pg. 36); and a data retrieval mechanism (folders) in communication with the data handler mechanism (graphical user interface) (receiving a mail message), the data retriever mechanism being arranged to obtain the data (file attachment) and to pass the data to the data handler mechanism (read mail/open attachment) (pg. 37-39; pg. 44-45; pg. 62-64). It would be obvious that in order to manipulate a program (display, open, print) one would have an interface. However, Gibbs does not teach the mapping mechanism.

Livingston teaches a mapping mechanism (Registry) in communication with the data handler mechanism (graphical user interface), the mapping mechanism being arranged to obtain

Art Unit: 2755

the command object (associated action/application) (pg. 262-264). Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the teachings of Gibbs with the teachings of Livingston in order to facilitate a document-centric functionality (pg. 261-262).

As to claim 9, Gibbs teaches a computer-implemented method for associating data (file attachment) with a command object in response to a request from an application (e-mail program), the method comprising: accessing the data (file attachment) through an interface in response to the request from the application (e-mail program, i.e. Elm/Pegasus/Pine/Eudora) (open the attachment) (pg. 36), wherein the request from the application is processed by the interface (graphical user interface) (pg. 37-39; pg. 44-45; pg. 62-64). It would be obvious that in order to manipulate a program (display, open, print) one would have an interface. However, Gibbs does not teach the mapping mechanism, the obtaining step, or the binding step.

Livingston teaches accessing a mapping mechanism (Registry) which is in communication with the interface (graphical user interface), the mapping mechanism being arranged to locate a command object (action/application) that is appropriate for the data (associated with a file), wherein the mapping mechanism is accessed by the interface (user right click or double click on file); obtaining the command object (action/application) that is appropriate for the data, wherein the mapping mechanism obtains the command object and passes the obtained command object to the interface (graphical user interface); and binding the command object (application) to the data (file), wherein the interface (graphical user interface) binds the command object to the data (opens

Art Unit: 2755

the data file in the application automatically) (pg. 262-264). It would be obvious that the command object (associated application) is returned to the application (e-mail program) in order for the e-mail program to execute the application and display the attached file (pg. 263). Refer to claim 1 for the motivation to combine.

As to claim 2, it would be obvious that a file would comprise a stream of bytes, and Livingston teaches the data handler mechanism is further arranged to bind the stream of bytes to the command object (associating action/application) (pg. 263).

As to claim 5, Gibbs teaches the data (attachment) is one of text data and image data (pg. 44).

As to claim 6, Gibbs teaches the data handler (graphical user interface) is further arranged to receive a request from the application (e-mail application) (open attachment) (pg. 37-39; pg. 44-45; pg. 62-64). However, Gibbs does not teach the binding step. Livingston teaches binding the data (file) to the command object (associating action/application) (pg. 262-264). It would be obvious that the command object (application) would be returned to the application (e-mail application) in order for the e-mail application to open the associating application and the file.

Art Unit: 2755

As to claim 8, Livingston teaches the mapping mechanism (Registry) includes a look-up table arranged to associate the command object (associating application) with the data (file extension) (pg. 268, One application associated with two file extensions).

As to claim 12, Gibbs teaches accessing a data retriever (folder) which is arranged to obtain the data (file attachment) (read mail/open attachment) (pg. 37-39; pg. 44-45; pg. 62-64). It would be obvious that the data could comprise of a stream of bytes.

As to claim 13, Livingston teaches operating on the data (file) using the command object (action/application) (pg. 262).

As to claim 14, Livingston teaches the command object (associated action/application) that is appropriate for the data (file) is selected from a set of command objects associated with a command list (Registry), and further including accessing the command list, wherein the command lists is accessed by the interface (graphical user interface) (click a file type) (pg. 262-264). It would be obvious that the Registry is associated with the file type in order to access the corresponding application or action.

As to claim 15, Gibbs teaches receiving a request for a command list (double click or right click file), the request for the command list being received by the interface (graphical user

Art Unit: 2755

interface), wherein the interface performs the steps of: obtaining a type associated with the data (file extensions to define file types); and obtaining the command list (associated actions) through the mapping (pg. 262-264). It would be obvious that the request could come from the e-mail program, since the program contains the message with the file attachment. It would also be obvious that the command list could be returned to the e-mail program in order for the associated action to be implemented or the application opened in order to access the data.

As to claims 16, 19, and 20, reference is made to computer-readable medium which corresponds to the method of claims 9, 13, and 14 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 9, 13, and 14 above.

3. Claims 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbs in view of Livingston as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of "Netscape Navigator" by Fulton.

As to claim 3, Livingston teaches wherein the data handler mechanism (graphical user interface) is further arranged to bind the data object (file) to the command object (associated action/application) (double click or right click file) (pg. 262-264). However, neither Gibbs nor Livingston teach a data content handler. Fulton teaches a data content handler mechanism (recipient e-mail program) in communication with the data handler mechanism (graphical user interface), the data content handler mechanism being arranged to convert the data (ASCII plain

Art Unit: 2755

text) into a data object (file) (pg. 205-206). Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the teachings of Gibbs with the teachings of Livingston and Fulton in order to facilitate the diversity of attachments (pg. 205).

As to claim 4, it would be obvious that the e-mail system could be in a Java environment. Therefore, the data object and the command object would both be of Java type.

As to claim 7, Gibbs teaches the data retriever mechanism (folder) includes a data source mechanism (message storage) arranged to obtain a stream of bytes (pg. 38, Figure 3.1), and Livingston teaches the data handler mechanism (graphical user interface) is further arranged to bind the data object (file) to the command object (associating action/application) (open the file in its associated application) (pg. 262-264). However, neither Gibbs nor Livingston teach the data content handler mechanism.

Fulton teaches the data content handler mechanism (recipient e-mail's program) arranged to convert the stream of bytes (ASCII plain text) into a data object (file) (uuencoding) (pg. 205-206). It would be obvious that the data source mechanism would be in communication with the data content handler mechanism in order to access the attachment and convert it back to its original form for accessing. Refer to claim 3 for the motivation to combine.

Art Unit: 2755

As to claim 10, Gibbs and Livingston substantially disclose the invention above. However, neither teach the cited functionality. Fulton teaches passing a stream of bytes to a data content handler mechanism (recipient e-mail program) arranged to create a data object (file) from the stream of bytes (ASCII plain text) (pg. 205-206). It would be obvious that the file would have to be passed to the interface in order to be accessed. Refer to claim 3 for the motivation to combine.


As to claim 11, it would be obvious that the e-mail system could be in a Java environment. Therefore, the data object and the command object would both be of Java type.

As to claims 17 and 18, reference is made to computer-readable medium which corresponds to the method of claims 10 and 11 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 10 and 11 above.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. whose telephone number is (703) 305-0439.

lab

July 13, 1999



ALVIN E. OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700